IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY

WRIT PETITION No. 180 of 1999

Between:

V.T.Chandra Sekhara Raju,
S/o.late Suryanarayana Raju,
Aged 39 years, R/o.Lalaguda, Secunderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
   Vizianagaram District.

2. The Mandal Revenue Officer, Parvathipuram
   Vizianagaram District.

3. The Village Administrative Officer,
   Parvathipuram, Vizianagaram District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue an appropriate writ or order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring as illegal, arbitrary and violative of provisions of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India the action of the respondents in not issuing a Social Status Certificate to the petitioner in the proforma prescribed by the Railways declaring that he belongs to Konda Dora Community which is a Scheduled Tribe and issue a consequential direction to the 1st respondent to forthwith issue the social status certificate to the

petitoner in terms of the provisions of Act 16 of 1993.

For the Petitioner: MR.D.V.SITARAMAMURTHY, Advocate

For the Respondent No.: GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following :

ORAL ORDER:

When the application of the petitioner for grant of Social Status Certificate was not considered, the petitioner approached this Court. This Court by interim order dated 28-01-1999 directed the first respondent to consider the application of the petitioner dated 06-11-1998 for grant of social status certificate, on his claim that he belongs to 'Konda Dora' Community. Though counter-affidavit is not filed, it is stated by the learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents that the claim of the petitioner is false.

On conducting enquiry, if it is found that the claim of the petitioner is false, it is always open for the respondents to reject the claim of the petitioner. But, at the same time, the respondent authorities can not keep the application pending without conducting any enquiry, into his claim. In that view of the matter, the interim order passed by this Court dated 28-01-1999 shall be treated as final order and it is open for the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner in accordance with law.

Subject to above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To

1. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
   Vizianagaram District.

2. The Mandal Revenue Officer, Parvathipuram
   Vizianagaram District.

3. The Village Administrative Officer,
   Parvathipuram, Vizianagaram District.

4. Two C.D.Copies.